



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,140	03/10/2000	Qiming Chen	10991147-1	5742

22879 7590 07/29/2003

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SHAFFER, ERIC T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/524,140

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Eric T. Shaffer

Art Unit

3623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 26 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

TARIC R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because the applicant fails to present a clear and convincing argument as to how applicant's invention of a distributed OLAP-Based Association Rule Generation Method and System is new and novel with respect to the same system presented in the prior art of Megiddo et al. Applicant's method and system for generating association rules is not significantly different from the Megiddo implementation of a method for determining association rules having a predetermined relationship to a dataset.

Applicant argues that Megiddo is directed at analysis of rules for statistical significance and concedes that the Megiddo reference does in fact recite "the mining of association rules is only mentioned in passing" and that "the Megiddo system apparently overcomes the drawback of these prior art approaches for estimating the statistical significance of association rules". However, statistical significance is the perfectly valid method by which the Megiddo invention generates or mines association rules.

Applicant argues that Megiddo does not teach a system that can quickly process large amounts of data, but concedes that the Megiddo system does support the processing of real-time information. However, applicants claims do not specifically address or even mention any aspect of large amounts of data or very large data sets. If the large volume of data in very large data sets is a key element of the invention, such features should warrant mention in the applicant's claims. Since the applicant's application does not mention the use of large volume data sets, this is not logical to fault Megiddo for failure to mention the same large volume data sets.

Applicant argues that the synthetic database taught by the Megiddo reference is not the same as the data cubes disclosed in the applicant's invention. However, the applicant does not discuss what a data cube is and how it differs, if it does in fact differ, from a database with two or more dimensions. The claims as written merely discuss a multidimensional database and do not specifically mention how a multidimensional database is different than the data cubes mentioned in the application. The synthetic database taught by Megiddo is a multidimensional database and therefore teaches the two or more dimensional database claimed by the applicant.

Since the alleged differences between the applicant's invention and the invention taught by the Megiddo reference are not significantly disclosed or discussed, the argument that the applicant's invention is a new or novel device is rejected.